



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RF

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,212	12/27/2000	Seiji Umemoto	Q62446	5362

7590

09/10/2003

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUNG T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,212

Applicant(s)

UMEMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Nguyen

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 10 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment dated 06/27/2003 has been received and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broer et al., US Patent No. 5,808,713, in view of Ciupke et al., US Patent No. 5,461,547 and Masuda et al., US Patent No. 6,340,999, as stated in the previous office action.
4. Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broer et al., US Patent No. 5,808,713, in view of Ciupke et al., US Patent No. 5,461,547 and Masuda et al., US Patent No. 6,340,999, and further in view of Koretoshi, JP 11-142618, as stated in the previous office action.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 10 is allowed.
6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: regarding claim 11, relevant prior art of record did not disclose, alone or in combination, an LCD device comprising a prismatic concave portions being constituted by discontinuous grooves each of which has a length of not smaller than five times as large as a depth of the groove and in

which a longitudinal direction of the groove is substantially parallel to a side surface of an LCD panel on which a light source is disposed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 06/27/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as follow:

Regarding claim 1, Applicants argue that the combined references do not teach or suggest the feature of the claimed invention (amendment, page 11), since Masuda et al. do not disclose the refractive index of the liquid crystal display substrate (amendment, page 13). The Examiner agrees that the refractive index of glass depends of the specification of the particular glass; however, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's viewpoint and respectfully invited the applicant to review the Masuda et al. reference (col. 16, lines 17) in which Masuda et al. do disclose that a liquid crystal display substrate can be "a glass plate or an acrylic plate" (the refractive index of the acrylic $n=1.491$). In other words, Masuda et al. do disclose a refractive index difference of the optical path changing sheet and a nearest LCD substrate is not higher than 0.15 as well as a refractive index difference of an adhesive layer and the nearest LCD substrate is not higher than 0.2 (or 0.1 in claim 6).

Accordingly, the limitation of claim 1 met.

Regarding claims 2-9 and 1-14, those claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1; therefore, those claims would have been obvious as stated in the previous office action.

Accordingly, the rejection of the above claims 1-9 and 11-14 stands.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-0423. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 703-305-3492. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

DN
09/02/2003


Dung Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2871